



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/821,928 | 03/30/2001 | Thomas N. Turba | RA 5390 (33012/320/101) | 8178 |

7590

04/22/2004

Charles A. Johnson
Unisys Corporation
P O Box 64942 MS 4773
St. Paul, MN 55164

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MERILYN P

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2171 | 6 |

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,928

Examiner

Merilyn P Nguyen

Applicant(s)

TURBA, THOMAS N.

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/02/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In response to the communication dated 04/02/2004, claims 1-20 are pending in this office action.
2. This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment and response filed April 2, 2004 (Paper #5). Applicant's arguments regarding the properness of the Finality of the last Office Action (mailed December 31, 2003, Paper #4) have been found persuasive and the Finality of said Office Action has been withdrawn. However, this response, filed 04/02/04, does not overcome the rejections made in the December 12/31/2003 Office Action for the reasons listed below.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 of copending Application No. 09/822686. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

Art Unit: 2171

patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same limitations.

Regarding claims 1, 6, and 16 of the instant application, these claims recite all the elements of claims 1, 6, and 16 of the '686 application, except that it further includes the limitation of presenting a plurality of valid steps as choices or selections for addition to each of plurality of discreet and independent steps. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the limitation of presenting a plurality of valid steps as choices or selections for addition to each of plurality of discreet and independent steps as claimed in the instant application, since with or without this limitation, the scope of the invention would not being changed. Further more, it's well known in the art that for each step there is always sub steps in order to a complete function. The motivation would have been to expand the overall use of claimed invention at no significant cost.

The subject matter of claims 2, 3, 5, 7-10, and 18-20 of the '686 application are same as claims 2, 3, 5, 7-10, and 18-20 of instant application.

Regarding claim 11 of the instant application, this claim recites all the elements of claim 11 of the '686 application, except that if further includes the iteration/repetition of steps in claim 11 of '686 application. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to repeat or iterate the steps of '686 application as claimed in the instant application. The motivation would have been to expand the overall use of claimed invention at no significant cost.

The subject matter of claims 13, 14, and 15 of the '928 application are same as claims 13, 14, and 15 of the instant application.

Art Unit: 2171

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beall (US 6,169,992).

Regarding claim 16, Beall teaches an apparatus includes Client Firewall 5125 for permitting a user to access Internet 5124 (Fig. 5), so that data base management services is provided such as service for accessing a data base management system (Col. 3, line 20 to Col. 4, line 27). Designing a service (query building) through specification of an ordered plurality of discreet and independent steps and presenting a plurality of valid potential steps for selection of each of said ordered plurality of discreet and independent steps are addressed in the analysis following: Beall teaches an ordered sequence of steps at Fig. 27 through Fig. 31. Beall presents plurality of potential steps within each of the ordered sequence of steps as example of Fig. 30, wherein there are steps of “select the knowledge base” and “select the class”. After chosen the desired knowledge base and class, the user click “next” to proceed next one of the order sequence of steps (Fig. 31, Beall at el.). This process repeats until user clicks “Finish” to complete the service.

Regarding claim 17, Beall discloses said Data Wizard inhibits presentation of any step which would not be valid for the corresponding position within said ordered sequence (Col. 30, lines 6-7, wherein the presentation of any step is inhibited by using "cancel button" Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 18, Beall discloses said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the Internet (Internet 5124, Fig. 3, Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 19, Beall teaches a commercial data base management system (See col. 3, lines 31-59, Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 20, Beall discloses said user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer (Client Computer 4018, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) having a commercially available browser (WWW Browser 4014, Fig. 3, Beall at el.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beall (US 6,169,992), in view of Black (US 6,285,998).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Beall discloses in a data processing system (Figs. 1-3) having a user terminal (Client Computer 4018) operated by a user which builds a service specifying one or more database management function for utilizing a data base management system which responds to an ordered sequence of command language script (787, Fig. 43, col. 36, line 64 to col. 37, line 35) responsively coupled to said user terminal via a publicly accessible digital data communication network (Col. 3, line 20 to Col. 4, line 27), the improvement comprising:

a Data Wizard (Figures 27-31) which permits said user to build said service as an ordered sequence of discrete and independent steps and which presents a plurality of valid steps as choices for addition at each position in said plurality of discrete and independent steps (Col. 30, line 1 to Col. 31, line 11).

Beall is silent as to building service as a table and storing this service for future use. On the other hand, Black teaches generating reusable database queries and as a table (queries correspond to services) by using wizard and storing queries in the query storage area for future user (See col. 4, line 60 to col. 5, line 28, Black et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to at the time of the invention was made to building service as a table and storing it for future use as taught by Black. One would have been motivated to modify Beall system as per above for the purpose of organizing steps into row and column so that enhancing dynamically building and utilizing customized services and for reusing the stored query so that user can perform database management function quickly.

Regarding claims 2, and 7, Beall/Black discloses said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the Internet (Internet 5124, Fig. 3, Beall et al.).

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 13-14, Beall/Black discloses said user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer (Client Computer 4018, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) having a commercially available browser (WWW Browser 4014, Fig. 3, Beall at el.).

Regarding claims 4, 8, and 12, Beall/Black discloses said Data Wizard inhibits presentation of any step which would not be valid for the corresponding position within said ordered sequence (Col. 30, lines 6-7, wherein the presentation of any step is inhibited by using "cancel button", Beall at el.).

Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, Beall/Black teaches a commercial data base management system (See col. 3, lines 31-59, Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 11, Beall/Black discloses a method of dynamically building a service (Figs. 27-31, Beall at el.) defined by a table which specifies at least one data based management function as addressed above in claim 1 from a user terminal (Client Computer 4018, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) coupled via a publicly accessible digital data network (Internet 5124, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) to a remote data base management system which responds to an ordered sequence of command language script (787, Fig. 43, col. 36, line 64 to col. 37, line 35, Beall at el.) having a component building process (Figs. 1-3, and Col. 3, line 20 to Col. 4, line 27, Beall at el.). Beall/Black teaches an ordered sequence of steps at Fig. 27 through Fig. 31. Beall/Black presents plurality of potential steps within each of the ordered sequence of steps as example of Fig. 30, wherein there

Art Unit: 2171

are steps of “select the knowledge base” and “select the class”. After chosen the desired knowledge base and class, the user click “next” to proceed next one of the order sequence of steps (Fig. 31, Beall at el.). This process repeats until user clicks “Finish” to complete the service. Beall/Black further discloses storing said completed service for future use as address above in claim 1.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant’s arguments filed on 04/02/2004 with respect to claims 1-20 have been fully considered but they are considered moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant’s remarks regarding the provisional double patenting rejection are noted. However, absent a terminal disclaiming or amendment patentability differentiating the inventions, the rejection stands.

Applicant states on page 9, “Claim 1, as amended, requires the user to build a service. The result of Beall’s approach is a data base management access. The result of Applicants’ claimed approach is a “service” which can be subsequently utilized to access a data base.” The examiner points out that Beall teaches building query by using wizard, building queries of Beall corresponds to building services. Even though built queries of Beall are not stored in storage for subsequently utilized to access a database. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been recognized that queries can be stored in query storage for future use as thus well known. Examiner uses Black et al. to clarify the obviousness of Beall system as Black storing built queries in a storage for subsequently utilized to access a database in the future.

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding to the amendment to claim 4, “automatically inhibits” haven’t given any patentable weight. In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958) (Appellant argued that claims to a permanent mold casting apparatus for molding trunk pistons were allowable over the prior art because the claimed invention combined “old permanent-mold structures together with a timer and solenoid which automatically actuates the known pressure valve system to release the inner core after a predetermined time has elapsed.” The court held that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art.).

Applicants argue that Beall has no “designing means”. The examiner respectively disagrees. Query Wizard of Figs 27-31 clear teach the designing means as user can customize his/her own query.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2171

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MN
April 16, 2004


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100